

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in a condition for allowance in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0055710 to Aoki *et al.* (hereinafter “Aoki”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,266,771 to Tow *et al.* (hereinafter “Tow”) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034868 to Fukuoka (hereinafter “Fukuoka”). Claims 1, 8 and 25 have been amended to better distinguish from the prior art and for the following reasons, the rejection has been rendered moot by the amendment.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Aoki does not teach providing to said user a capacity to delete scene segments skipped by said user using said user interface. Thus, Tow was cited as teaching this limitation. Claims 1, 8 and 25 have now been amended to clarify that the skipped scene segments to be deleted “were skipped by said user *during playback* using said user interface.” Tow teaches skipping or deleting unwanted scenes according to a rating, for example to create a PG-rated movie from an R-rated movie. According to Tow, this is accomplished by detecting editorial information associated with a particular frame and dropping the frame if the editorial information indicates that the frame contains a content rating (R-rated content, for example) that exceeds a rating selected by a user (see column 14, lines 20-44; see also column 4, lines 29-58). Thus, according to Tow, frames or scenes are automatically skipped or deleted by the system according to a parameter set by the user *in advance*. By contrast, the present invention requires that the skipping (and subsequent deletion) of a scene segment is caused by the user during playback. The teachings of Tow do not disclose or suggest that scenes would be skipped manually by the user, as in the present invention. Moreover, such manual deletion would defeat the intent of Tow’s invention, which allows all of the undesired or inappropriate scenes to be automatically deleted according to their rating. Also, requiring the scenes to be skipped by the user during playback would necessarily result in at least a portion of the inappropriate (e.g. R-rated) material to be viewed before it could be skipped. Accordingly, Tow

effectively teaches away from the user skipping scenes *during playback*, as required by claims 1, 8 and 25. Further, nothing in Aoki or Fukuoka teaches are suggests this feature. Therefore, even if the teachings of Aoki, Tow and Fukuoka were combined, every limitation of claim 1, 8 and 25 would not be taught or rendered obvious by the resulting combination. Further, since claims 2-6 and 9-13 depend, respectively, from claims 1 and 8, they are also nonobvious for the same reasons. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn in view of the amendments.

Claims 15 and 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aoki. Claims 20-23 are canceled by amendment herein. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed as it pertains to claims 15, 18 and 19.

With regard to claim 15, Aoki does not teach “regenerating said database table during said playback of said stored broadcast program *when said user wants to edit said broadcast program*,” as required. Aoki does not contain any teaching relating to editing of a broadcast program by a user, either expressly or implicitly. Therefore, since every limitation of the claim is not taught by the reference, claim 15 is not fully anticipated by Aoki. Further, since claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 15, they are not anticipated by Aoki for the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

New claims 26-33 have been added by amendment. These claims are also patentable for at least the reasons described above with regard to claims 1, 8 and 25.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. ACER-45195.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: June 8, 2009